## plan = more guns

### 3D Printing

#### Gun control is unenforceable- people can make them with computers.

Rosenwald 13 Michael S. (reporter) “Weapons made with 3-D printers could test gun-control efforts” February 18th 2013 The Washington Post <https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/weapons-made-with-3-d-printers-could-test-gun-control-efforts/2013/02/18/9ad8b45e-779b-11e2-95e4-6148e45d7adb_story.html?hpid=z1> JW

[Brackets in original] Three-dimensional printers offer a potentially easy way around restrictions and registrations — a source of growing consternation among gun-control advocates and some allies in Congress. “There’s really no one controlling what you do in your own home,” Lerol said. Though printing guns is a craft still in its infancy — Lerol hasn’t tested his parts yet at a gun range — technology experts, gun rights proponents and gun safety advocates say the specter of printable firearms and ammunition magazines poses a challenge for Obama and lawmakers as they craft sweeping gun-control legislation. One controversial idea, pushed by Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.), is to outlaw high-capacity magazines. But some proponents of 3-D printed guns have already made high-grade plastic replicas. “Obviously, that has to be one of her nightmares,” said Larry Pratt, executive director of Gun Owners of America, a lobbying group opposed to additional restrictions. “If her ban was to pass and this technology moves beyond its infancy, Dianne Feinstein is going to have a bit of a challenge.” Feinstein’s proposed legislation, which would also ban AR-15s, restricts manufacturing of such items by anyone in the country, said a spokesman for the senator. But 3D-printing experts say that logic is dated and misses the point of the technology. Making guns for personal use has been legal for decades, but doing so has required machining know-how and a variety of parts. With 3-D printers, users download blueprints from the Internet, feed them into the machine, wait several hours and voila. “Restrictions are difficult to enforce in a world where anybody can make anything,” said Hod Lipson, a 3-D printing expert at Cornell University and co-author of the new book, “Fabricated: The New World of 3D Printing.” “Talking about old-fashioned control will be very ineffective.” It is unclear how many people are trying to print their own gun parts and magazines. But Cody Wilson, a University of Texas law student who is leading the ideological and technical campaign for 3-D printed guns through an organization called Defense Distributed, said blueprints have been downloaded hundreds of thousands of times from his group’s Web site. “People all over the world are downloading this stuff all the time — way more people than actually have 3-D printers,” he said. “This is hot stuff on the Internet now.” Wilson and a friend founded Defense Distributed last February while looking for a “post-political” project to challenge governmental scrutiny and regulations. He speaks of “prohibitionist regimes” and anarchistic urges and challenging “democratic control.” Though he shot guns as a Boy Scout, Wilson doesn’t consider himself a gun person. He doesn’t consider himself a tech geek either. His motivations, he said, are ideological and go way beyond the Second Amendment. “This is a symbolic challenge to a system that says we can see everything, regulate everything,” he said. “I say, ‘Oh really?’ My challenge is: Regulate this. I hope with that challenge we create such an insurmountable problem that the mere effort of trying to regulate this explodes any regulatory regime.” Wilson’s group has posted several videos to YouTube of AR-15s firing rounds with 3-D printed high-capacity magazines and lower receivers, the part that includes the firing mechanism and is the only regulated portion of the gun if it’s bought over the counter. Wilson’s parts are made from high-grade polymer and retrofitted to the bodies of existing weapons. The receivers are made able to fire by adding over-the-counter springs, pins and a trigger. In one recent video, Wilson fires dozens of rounds from an M-16 using a 3-D printed high-capacity magazine. “How’s that national conversation going?” he asks. Defense Distributed also runs a Web site called Defcad, where anyone can download gun designs and trade tips. The other day, a user posted this question to a discussion board on the site: “I know nothing of 3d printers. I can tell there are a few different types of materials to print and some appear to be easier to break than others. What printer and material is the best for printing a receiver and mags?” Lerol, working in his spare bedroom, is using a $1,300 machine called the Cube, which is made by a division of 3D Systems, a large publicly traded manufacturer of consumer and industrial 3-D printing machines. The cheaper, consumer versions of 3-D printers like the one Lerol uses are only capable of printing with plastics, while more expensive, industrial-scale machines can print sturdier materials such as high-grade polymers. Experts expect printer prices to fall as part of the normal technology curve. (Think about the price of flat screen TVs five years ago. Or a computer two decades ago.) And that makes Lipson, the Cornell expert, nervous because cheaper machines could help people make cheap guns for one-time use. “The threat is not of 3-D printing military-grade weapon components from standard blueprints on industrial 3-D printers,” Lipson said. “The challenge is that [do-it-yourself] 3D printers can be used by anyone to print rogue, disposable and shoddy guns that could be used to fire a few rounds, then be recycled into a flower vase.” Though Lerol acknowledges how easy these machines make it to get around regulations, his motivations, he said, are benign. He is a tinkerer, he likes guns and he likes messing around the house. He insists he has no interest in flouting whatever restrictions might win approval, but gun-control advocates and some legislators worry that not everyone’s motivations will be so pure. “It’s not necessarily the technology, it’s the ideology,” said Joshua Horwitz, the executive director of Coalition to Stop Gun Violence. “If this insurrectionist philosophy was to gain traction, people will normalize this behavior.”

#### Outweighs:

A) my evidence is recent and makes future predictions about tech curves but your studies are based on what’s happened in the past.

B) strength of link- even if they win status quo regulations are bad, I prove the plan decreases the amount of regulations by fostering an anti-regulatory sentiment among citizens.

C) magnitude-the guns are cheaper, easier to access, and can be made by anyone with internet which magnifies all the aff impacts

### Illicit Markets

#### Plan pushes people to the illicit market where guns are cheaper and more available-increases gun use.

Kopel 93 David B. (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, a Denver, Colorado think-tank. He also serves as an Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., and as a techincal consultant to the International Wound Ballistics Association. J.D. 1985, University of Michigan Law School; B.A. Brown University, 1982. Kopel's book, THE SAMURAI, THE MOUNTIE AND THE COWBOY: SHOULD AMERICA ADOPT THE GUN CONTROLS OF OTHER DEMOCRACIES? was awarded the Comparative Criminology Prize by the American Society of Criminology's Division of International Criminology) “PERIL OR PROTECTION? THE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF HANDGUN PROHIBITION” Saint Louis University Public Law Review Volume 12, 1993 <http://www.constitution.org/2ll/2ndschol/63perilo.htm> JW

Dixon expects the "fact that such guns are inaccurate and dangerous to the user will also act as a restraint to illegal gun production." [129] How much of a restraint may be open to doubt. While homemade guns will not win target- shooting contests, target shooters will have their own guns (kept at shooting ranges under the Dixon proposal), and homemade guns may suffice for robbery purposes. And most homicides, like most robberies, are perpetrated at very close range where accuracy is not an issue. The risk that a homemade gun could explode in a shooter's hand may deter some otherwise law-abiding citizens who would want to own an illegal handgun for protection. On the other hand, if the person believes that the threats to his or her life and family are serious enough to commit the serious crime of buying an illegal handgun, the additional risk posed by potentially defective handgun may seem small. In addition, newfound popularity for bootleg guns might result in handguns becoming cheaper than they are now, just as in alcohol prohibition days, bootleg gin often cost less than legal alcohol had. If handguns were cheaper, they might become more available to small-time teenage criminals and other low-end miscreants; criminals might end up more widely armed than ever before. The inevitable [illicit] black market in homemade and imported illegal handguns would provide a major new revenue source to organized crime. As the black market in alcohol helped create and enrich organized crime in the United States, the new black market in handguns would fund and strengthen organized crime all the more. Dixon also acknowledges that illegal handguns would also flow in across American borders. [130] Indeed, if small handguns were imported in the same physical volume as marijuana, 20 million would enter the country annually. (Current legal demand for new handguns is about 2.5 million a year). [131]

#### This outweighs:

A) they’ll say the plan increases gun prices but my evidence proves that illicit market guns are cheaper than guns in the squo which means once people realize they can access them, people will be more widely armed

B) turns back all your internal links- there are at least some regulations on guns in the status quo but the illicit market is by definition unregulatable so we always solve case better. Also outweighs on probability- it happened during prohibition.

Jacobs 04 James (Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice New York University School of Law) Can Gun Control Work? “Prohibition and Disarmament” 2004 Oxford Scholarship Online JW

Closing down legitimate manufacturers would be a boon to black market (p.161) producers. Clandestine handgun manufacturers would spring up, just as thousands of illegal stills operated during alcohol prohibition, and hundreds or thousands of clandestine labs now produce unlawful mood and mind-altering drugs like amphetamine and ecstasy. Even today, “zip guns” are produced or assembled in small workshops within the United States.\* These black market manufacturers, already illegal, operate outside any regulatory scheme for recordkeeping, serial numbers, safety locks, or taxation.

### Substitution

#### A handgun ban makes criminals to switch to deadlier weapons-empirics prove.

Kopel 93 David B. (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, a Denver, Colorado think-tank. He also serves as an Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., and as a techincal consultant to the International Wound Ballistics Association. J.D. 1985, University of Michigan Law School; B.A. Brown University, 1982. Kopel's book, THE SAMURAI, THE MOUNTIE AND THE COWBOY: SHOULD AMERICA ADOPT THE GUN CONTROLS OF OTHER DEMOCRACIES? was awarded the Comparative Criminology Prize by the American Society of Criminology's Division of International Criminology) “PERIL OR PROTECTION? THE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF HANDGUN PROHIBITION” Saint Louis University Public Law Review Volume 12, 1993 <http://www.constitution.org/2ll/2ndschol/63perilo.htm> JW

If handguns were somehow removed from the hands of malfeasants, would the death toll actually increase? Some gun misusers would switch to knives (not much less deadly than small handguns), while others would switch to rifles and shotguns (much more likely to kill than handguns). If enough misusers switched from handguns to long guns, the death toll might therefore increase, or so the "substitution argument" goes. Dixon confronts the substitution argument carefully, and provides one of the most comprehensive critiques of substitution theory ever offered by a handgun prohibitionist. \*327 Dixon is right to take the substitution argument seriously. While handgun wounds are usually survivable, especially if the victim gets medical attention quickly, shotgun blasts at close range are much more likely to be fatal. The shotgun fires a large slug, or from six to more than sixty pellets, with one trigger squeeze. A single shotgun pellet, because it may be of a diameter equal to a small handgun bullet, can inflict nearly as much damage as a small handgun bullet. [177] Wound ballistics and firearms experts concur that at short range, a shotgun is by far the deadliest weapon. [178] Anti-prohibition writers such as David Hardy, Gary Kleck, and Don Kates have argued that a high level of substitution of long guns for handguns would occur in the case of a hypothetical American handgun ban. Dixon offers a careful rebuttal of their arguments, and concludes that (since he has placed the burden of proof on prohibition opponents) the case for a substitution effect has not been proven convincingly enough to overcome what he considers the strong evidence for handgun prohibition. Overlooked in the discussion of a substitution effect resulting from a hypothetical American handgun ban is non- hypothetical evidence from other countries. As Dixon showed earlier in his article, countries with more handguns per capita tend to have more handgun homicides per capita. [179] Switzerland, which has, by world standards, relatively lenient handgun laws, has more handgun homicides per capita than countries where handgun laws are tougher. [180] From the handgun density/handgun homicide correlation in Switzerland and other nations (as well as from other evidence detailed supra), Dixon concludes that handgun density strictly correlates with handgun homicide. [181] Let us \*328 assume that Dixon is right. In countries such as Australia and Canada, where handgun laws are much stricter than in Switzerland, the handgun homicide rate is lower than in Switzerland, but the total homicide rate is over 100 percent greater. [182] The reason cannot be that Australians and Canadians are more prone to want to kill somebody than the Swiss are - Dixon has explicitly assumed that human nature in developed countries is roughly similar everywhere. [183] So why then do Canada and Australia have more murders, even though they have stricter handgun laws, and fewer handgun murders? One plausible explanation is the substitution effect. A sufficiently large number of Australians and Canadians, unable to obtain handguns, do their shooting with rifles or shotguns; their victims die, whereas if they had been shot with handguns, many would have survived. Although some Australian and Canadian assailants, unable to obtain handguns, switched to less deadly weapons (such as clubs), the number of assailants who switched to rifles and shotguns was sufficiently large to increase the overall death toll. If we have plausible evidence to suggest that a substitution effect may have occurred in Australia and Canada, could a similar effect occur in the United States? [184] \*329 Dixon quotes research developed by Don Kates and Mark Benenson that if 30% of persons attempting homicide switched from handguns to long guns, while the other 70% switched to knives, total homicide would increase substantially. If 50% switched to long guns, the homicide rate could double, even if none of the persons switching to knives killed anyone. [185] A National Institute of Justice study of felons in state prisons found that 72% of the handgun criminals said they would switch to sawed-off shotguns if handguns became unavailable. [186] A 72% substitution rate would lead to an enormous multiplication of the current homicide rate, and Kleck expects that substitution would occur at about 70%. Dixon retorts that criminals are apt to be braggarts and liars, and might claim that nothing, including a handgun ban, could stop them from committing any crime they chose. Accordingly, the 72% substitution figure might be too high. True enough. But at the same time, at least some criminals may be highly suspicious and mistrustful of authority. Although the National Institute of Justice polling, conducted through written response to written questions, offered the respondents anonymity, some of the prisoners might have believed that their responses would not in fact be anonymous; the polling might be a "setup" to discern their plans after release, and provide a reason for denying parole. Thus, some handgun criminals might have falsely said that they would not substitute sawed-off shotguns for unavailable handguns. Do the number of braggart criminals who falsely said that they would use sawed-off shotguns outnumber the number of mistrustful criminals who falsely said they would not? It is difficult to say with certainty. But since 72% of the criminals said they would substitute, and since only 30% substitution is needed to increase substantially the homicide rate, there is a wide margin for error to assume that bragging criminals outnumber suspicious ones. Dixon critiques the Benenson and Kates estimate of a homicide rate increase because Benenson and Kates assumed that handgun users who did not switch to long guns would switch "downward" to the next most deadly weapon, knives. Almost certainly, some handgun users would, rather than using knives, turn to even less deadly weapons, such as fists, or would not attempt murder in the first place, absent a handgun. [187]

#### This turns case and outweighs on probability- people will be afraid of an assault rifles ban and stock up on those weapons.

Esposito and Finley 14 Luigi Esposito (Associate Professor of Sociology and Criminology at Barry University) and Laura Finley (Assistant professor of Sociology and Criminology at Barry University) “Beyond Gun Control: Examining Neoliberalism, Pro-gun Politics and Gun Violence in the United States” Theory in Action, Vol. 7, No. 2, April (© 2014) <http://transformativestudies.org/wp-content/uploads/10.3798tia.1937-0237.14011.pdf> JW

NEOLIBERALISM AND THE SECOND AMENDMENT According to various commentators, the modem Second Amendment/Pro-gun Movement gained momentum in the mid-20th century as a backlash against the advances made by the Feminist and Civil Rights Movements (e.g., Burbick 2006; Connel 2005; Ansell 2001). Specifically, the Second Amendment became a tool to defend White male privilege against the threat of an activist government (what by the 1980s become widely known as the "nanny state") that supported feminist ideals and coddled racial minorities and other presumably "undeserving" groups. These fears, combined with laws such as the Gun Control Act of 1968, are also what, at least in part, prompted the radicalization of the National Rifle Association (NRA). Indeed, by the 1970s, the NRA "underwent a political revolution" and went from being primarily a sports organization to a far right pro-gun lobby (e.g., Melzer 2009). By the early 1980s, neoliberalism gained prominence under the Reagan administration. Interestingly, it was during the Reagan administration's neoliberal restructuring of the "American political, economic, and cultural landscape" that this country witnessed an increase in gun violence and especially a rise in mass shootings.5 As Reagan's neoliberal reforms gutted the welfare state and the idea of self-reliance became promulgated as synonymous with a free society, success became increasingly "defined in terms of power, economic attainment, and social status" (Klein 2012, p. 156). All these measures, according to various critics, promoted an apathetic society where social bonds became increasingly eroded and replaced by hedonistic materialism, rabid individualism, extreme competition, and narcissism (e.g., Klein 2012, see also Hall, Winlow, and Ancram 2005). To a large extent, this trend continues to this day. As has been widely documented, since the Reagan era, there has been a dismantling of community in favor of a hyperindividualized type of liberty in which the unrestrained pursuit of selfgain is valued over everything else (e.g., Giroux 2008; Esposito, 2011). In recent years, millions of Americans who embrace the neoliberal emphasis on individual liberty over everything else have become particularly suspicious about the U.S. government under President Obama. Because the president has, to some extent, shown more willingness than many previous presidents to deploy the power of the state to promote a variety of social and economic objectives-e.g., signing the Recovery Act, passing Healthcare Reform, strengthening the nation's safety net for the needy, etc.- millions of Americans regard this as a shift to "socialism." Consistent with neoliberal philosophy, a large segment of the American electorate believes that Obama's presumably interventionist policies signify the onset of a growing state apparatus (an unprecedented "big government") whose influence will gradually seep into every facet of social life and undermine personal liberty, self-reliance, and the free market. In short, millions of Americans believe that Obama's policies are paving the "road to serfdom" feared by Hayek (1944). In recent months, calls for tighter gun control among President Obama and other people in government (e.g., Senator Dianne Feinstein's proposal to re-instate a federal ban on assault weapons) have further reinforced fears of tyranny and government intrusion on Americans' "private lives."6 Stated simply, the Second Amendment, which is often regarded by the pro-gun/anti-gun control community as a requisite for freedom and the primary basis for all other individual rights, is believed by millions of Americans to be currently under attack. Even a cursory reading of some of the statements put out by the NRA and other pro-gun groups-particularly against President Obamaclearly reveals this sentiment. For example, in his recent book titled America Disarmed, Wayne LaPierre (2011), CEO of the NRA, argues that President Obama is the most anti-Second Amendment president the country has ever seen. LaPierre associates the president's presumably anti-gun zealotry to allegations that Obama has been profoundly influenced by supporters of communism such as Frank Marshall Davis and other alleged sympathizers of totalitarian governments. LaPierre even suggests that Obama's own fatheran alleged "anti-Western Communist"- might have shaped his presumably fanatical anti-gun/anti-Second Amendment stance, as Obama Sr. "favored the kind of oppressive discriminatory government that almost necessarily requires a disarmed populace" (LaPierre, 2011, p. 265). Important to note is that this fear of tyranny promoted by LaPierre and the NRA in general has undoubtedly benefitted the gun industry. As Fang (2012) notes: Fear that the government will disallow guns has resulted in Americans flocking to stores to stock up on weapons-lots of them. From Alaska to Florida, gun sales across the country are going through the roof...In Tennessee, officials say gun purchases likely hit an all-time high. Walmart has reportedly run out of semiautomatic rifles in five states. Interestingly, the NRA itself benefits financially from gun and ammunition sales, a fact not widely known by the public. As suggested by Dreier (2013): On its website, the National Rifle Association claims that it is not affiliated with any firearm or ammunition manufacturers or with any businesses that deal in guns and ammunition. This is a lie, as a number of recent reports have documented. In fact, the NRA is primarily a front group for the nation's gun manufacturers. The NRA receives a dollar for every gun or package of ammunition sold at participating stores. Other NRA corporate fundraising initiatives also allow customers to make donations to the NRA at the time of purchase. Some, like Sturm, Roger & Co., even mandate contributions for every purchase. And, importantly, since these deals are part of the NRA's 501(c)4 affiliate, not its' 501(c)3 status, the funds can be spent on political advertisements and for lobbying for gun-friendly legislation (Fang, 2012). Sugarmann (2012), for example, notes that between 2005 and 2010, the NRA received somewhere between $19.8 and $52.6 million in contributions from corporate partners, most of which (74%) are gun or ammunitions manufacturers or producers of other shootingrelated products. Considering all this, the argument can be made that the fear tactics used by the NRA are consistent with what Naomi Klein describes in her book The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism. Namely, by encouraging fear that "Obama will take our guns," the NRA manipulates public opinion to push a neoliberal agenda associated with de-regulation that benefits the gun industry. The NRA, of course, is not alone in promoting this sort of fear mongering. Similar arguments about Obama's and other politicians' proposed gun controls being an attempt to disarm Americans in an effort to institute a tyrannical "big government" have been made in recent months by various public officials, media pundits, and at anti-gun control rallies, which are overwhelmingly attended by White men.7 According to various writers, this fear of disarmament and tyranny are also typically racialized in that they are often expressions of "anxieties associated with White men's declining status" (Carlson, 2012, p. 1113). On this point, Tom Diaz, author of several books about the gun industry, recently noted the following in an interview: If you look at where these guns are sold, this is primarily a Red State phenomenon. People are driven by a fear of the other. NRA President Wayne LaPierre talks often in terms of race and ethnicity. The gun industry's consumers are afraid, the world is changing around them, and they think guns will protect their way of life (Winston & Graham, 2013). These fears, however, also go beyond a racial issue. Indeed, what is at stake, according to many gun supporters, is not simply a threat to White privilege and gun ownership but the future offreedom itself Referring to the alleged menace of gun control, Forbes magazine's Lawrence Hunter (2012) recently wrote: It's not really about the guns; it is about the government's ability to demand submission of the people. Gun control is part and parcel of the ongoing collectivist effort to eviscerate individual sovereignty and replace it with dependence upon and allegiance to the state. Another related narrative used among gun supporters to oppose gun controls is that such measures leave responsible, law abiding citizens without any viable means of protecting themselves against criminals and/or violent predators. Consistent with the neoliberal claim that government is inept, this common argument is predicated on the idea that the state (this includes the police and other law enforcement agencies) is inefficient and thus largely incapable of protecting citizens (see Carlson 2012). Disarming the public is thus akin to a proverbial "throwing the lambs to the wolves" scenario. This distrust of government, along with the fact that fear of crime in the U.S. is out of proportion to actual crime rates (e.g., Shelden, 2010), encourages an insistence among millions of Americans to want easy access to guns as a way to protect themselves, their families, and their property. This logic fits perfectly with (and is reinforced by) neoliberal ideology and its emphasis on private solutions to all problems. This same ideology is also what has encouraged and glamorized the sort of rugged individualism that is at the heart of pro-gun politics.